

The Republican.

No. 4. Vol. V.] LONDON, FRIDAY, Jan. 25, 1822. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE ISLAND OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Dorchester Gaol, Jan. 21,

Year 3, of the Spanish Revolution.

NONE but Republicans can deserve that name, the advocates of Monarchy, limited or unlimited, are the advocates of slavery, and cannot lay claim to the title of citizens, or free men with free minds. Is there a man in Britain who would now rise in a public assembly and denounce Republicanism as visionary? If there be, I would point the attention of that man to the two continents of America. Let him read the following beautiful speech of Simon Bolivar, the Republican of Columbia, and from that learn how to make speeches fit to be addressed to an assembly of free men, or men wishing to be free. This speech too, was made on the very important occasion of pledging himself to fulfil with justice the office of Chief Magistrate, not under the odious and blood thirsty name of King, but that of President of a nation of Republicans. It may be first proper to state that Simon Bolivar has strenuously objected to the propriety of his being elected Chief Magistrate of his country, whilst that country was engaged in war with the enemies of liberty, and whilst he wore the sword as a general of her armies. He has done every thing that a man could do to relinquish one of the two offices, but the both have been forced on him by his grateful countrymen. This is as it should be. I do not speak of the propriety of joining two such offices, but if there be a man of extraordinary virtue in a country, the people of that country have a right to demand that he shall be their chief magistrate as long as they may think proper.

Simon Bolivar has eclipsed all the Republican heroes that have gone before him. The name of Washington dwindles into insignificance before that of Bolivar. He is the only

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street.

true model of a true Republican at the head of a nation, which history has recorded. Attend to his speech. Learn every word of it. Teach it to your children. Write it on the portals of your doors; over your fire-places; in every place where it can be constantly catching the eye, and reminding you in what a true Republican consists. Simon Bolivar spake thus to the Representatives of the People of Columbia, when invested for a further period with the office and power of Chief Magistrate:—

“I AM THE SON OF WAR, THE MAN WHOM BATTLES HAVE RAISED TO THE MAGISTRACY. THIS SWORD WILL BE OF NO USE ON THE DAY OF PEACE; AND THAT SHALL BE THE LAST OF MY POWER, BECAUSE I HAVE SWORN IT WITHIN MYSELF; BECAUSE, I HAVE PROMISED IT TO COLUMBIA; AND BECAUSE, THERE CAN BE NO REPUBLIC WHEN THE PEOPLE ARE NOT SECURE IN THE EXERCISE OF THEIR OWN POWERS. A MAN LIKE ME IS A DANGEROUS CITIZEN IN A POPULAR GOVERNMENT—IS A DIRECT MENACE TO THE NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY. I WISH TO BECOME A CITIZEN IN ORDER TO BE FREE, AND THAT ALL MAY BE SO TOO. I PREFER THE TITLE OF CITIZEN TO THAT OF LIBERATOR, BECAUSE THIS EMANATES FROM WAR—THAT FROM THE LAWS.”

Buonaparte was a fool, a rogue, and a despot when compared with Bolivar. His name will not deserve mention in the same page of history with the latter. The former may be ranked with Alexander, with Tamerlane, and with Jengis Khan, but if Bolivar pursues his present line of conduct through life, he will establish quite a new character, as an example to future generations of men. He will combine the Philosopher with the Patriot, the Philanthropist with the Soldier, and the whole with the Republican, such as no man ever did before him, and will shew us how every character and disposition should yield to that of the virtuous Republican Citizen.

As a few days will bring with them the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Paine, and as you will assemble on that day, as far as possible, as a mark of respect to his memory, and gratitude for his writings and actions, I shall take the liberty to insert here such toasts and sentiments as to me seem proper to lead on that occasion:—

1. The Memory of Thomas Paine, the Father of true Republicanism, upon the base of the Representative System of Government.

2. The Memories of Washington and Jefferson, and all

the past Republicans of the United States of America, and may the present improve so as to abolish Superstition and Fanaticism in their country, and, particularly, the foul and infamous traffic in Negro Slaves; and be mindful of him who taught, by his pen and example, their fathers, how to obtain and preserve liberty, for their children.

3. Simon Bolivar, and the Republicans of Columbia, may they abolish Priestcraft as well as Kingcraft.

4. Thomas Cochrane, commonly called Lord Cochrane, and Joseph Martin, his companion in arms, with the Republicans of Chili and Peru, may they too abolish Priestcraft.

5. Peter Boyer, and the Republicans of the Island of St. Domingo. We despise not their colour, but hail them as brothers.

6. The Republicans of Spain and Portugal, and may they annihilate the last vestige of Kingcraft and Priestcraft.

7. The French Revolution, and may the next be free both of a Robespierre and a Buonaparte.

8. Success to the Greeks, if they fight for the Representative System of Government.

9. Success to the Republicans of the Island of Great Britain, and may the talkers about Reform, advance and avow the only principles that can produce and preserve it.

10. Health, Prosperity, and Happiness to every Republican on the face of the Earth, and may the toast soon apply to every man.

11. May every virtuous Woman prefer a Republican for her husband, and train up her children in a detestation of slavery: and may every woman be virtuous.

12. As the human mind is improved by exercise, may every human being learn the importance of free discussion.

Such are the toasts and sentiments I would recommend to every assembly of Republicans on the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Paine. I do not say that they should be confined to these, to the exclusion of all others, but certainly, I do think they are such as should take the lead of all others. They display nothing like party or faction, and I would much rather that my own name should never be toasted, than that it should ever form the watchword of party or of faction. I say let us unite, if that union can be effected on sound principles. My hand is open to the hand of every man, who will either avow the principles I avow, or shew me fairly that I am in error as to their tendency.

At the present moment it may not be amiss that I address a few words to you upon the character of Thomas Paine. I have no idea that I can add any thing to what has been already said of him, but I may concentrate his general character within a small compass, so as to refresh your memories and give you a full recollection of him whose birth-day you will shortly meet to celebrate. I am no poet, and as I cannot write an ode, I must do the best I can in prose.

Thomas Paine was born on the 29th day of January, in the year of the Carpenter's Wife's Son 1737. Before a century has elapsed from his birth, it appears likely that his principles will have made the tour of Europe, as they have already made the tour of the two continents of America. The divine and omnipotent idolatry of the Christians, as they call their religion, was two centuries making one-fourth part of the progress that the principles of Thomas Paine have made within fifty years of their birth, and within eleven years of the death of their author; whilst the latter have made way against a more powerful degree of persecution than the former, or a persecution more calculated to arrest their progress. Every existing institution has attempted to strangle the principles of Thomas Paine in their birth: whilst the Christians passed unmolested until they grew so insolent as to defy the administerers of the Roman laws, and to challenge death as a martyrdom, which their frenzied brains were led to believe would procure them eternal happiness, and what they called a crown of glory in the company of their crucified God. The principles of Thomas Paine have been an appeal to the calm and deliberate reason of mankind: the principles of the Christian idolatry an appeal to a fanatic passion, which encouraged a gross ignorance of, and a gross outrage upon the laws of Nature. The former have their foundation in Nature: the latter defy and contemn it, and have no foundation but in an ignorant and brutal fanaticism, which has tended to preserve one of the very worst kinds of barbarism, and which has constantly warred with and endeavoured to crush every thing in the shape or progress of civilization.

To come to a closer epitome of the principles of Thomas Paine, I will define them as embracing, in politics, the Representative System of Government, with an Elective Magistracy: in matters of theology and philosophy, a free discussion on all subjects connected therewith, and a rejection of the gross idolatry of Pagan, Jew, Christian, or Mahometan.

He first displayed his political principles, and was the first man who struck an effectual blow at the tyranny of Kingly or Monarchical Despotism. It was such a blow as has kept it reeling to this day, and down it must all fall. It has no chance of recovering its former posture, and again standing firm and daring as heretofore. His pamphlet, entitled "Common Sense," was to Monarchy, what we read in the Jew Books, the smooth stone and sling of David was to the head of Goliath. The simile is good : the British Goliath defied the armies of the American God of Liberty, and our modern David struck him down with a stone gathered from the pure and limpid stream of "Common Sense." He, too, needed not the shield and buckler of the tyrant Saul, but took for his weapon a goose-quill. He had confidence in the goddess Reason, when assisted both by the Mercury and the Minerva of Common Sense.

Having emancipated one nation from the thraldom of Kingcraft, he flew to Europe to assist in the emancipation of others. His native country was never absent from his view after he had once tasted the means of giving it Liberty. He crossed back the Atlantic Ocean to revisit his native countrymen, and wrote a volume in which he shewed them the only basis upon which the RIGHTS OF MAN can be established. He did not live to witness the regeneration of his native land, but he died with the satisfaction that he had sown the seed of that regeneration, which the breath of Monarchy could not blast whenever it should shoot forth and blossom to ripeness.

In France he suffered much in the cause of liberty and humanity ; and it was by mere accident that his blood had not been shed as a sacrifice to the jealousy and ambition of Robespierre. At this momentous crisis, this apparent last period of his life, he wrote his "Age of Reason," to the great terror of all bigots, and to the illumination of the mind of every free inquirer after truth. It is difficult to distinguish between the comparative importance of his political and his theological writings ; but in effect they seem to be equal ; in design they have the same object, the improvement, and welfare, and happiness of the human race. His views were not confined to one country : his benevolent and comprehensive mind embraced the whole of mankind. His motives and his manners were ever Republican in the fullest degree of the word.

The English Government was too wicked and corrupt to harbour such a man within the pale of its powers. He was

outlawed for having written his "Rights of Man." Honourable conduct brings honours on its possessor; and next to the honour of having written the "Rights of Man," may be rated the honour of an expulsion from within the pale of English Laws, and so corrupt a Government.

After the revolution was again destroyed in France, and a Military Despotism established, this unceasing advocate of Liberty sought again for shelter in the United States of America, under that Republic which his pen had both produced and fostered. But here he was pursued by the emissaries of the English Government, and his life embittered with a series of neglects, annoyances, and insults. One of the very best friends of man that ever lived suffered in his life-time the greatest ingratitude that was ever heaped upon one man by his fellow men. Because he had never sought after office in the Republic which he had formed, the creatures who had got into power, during his absence in Europe, affected not to know him on his return, and neglected to give him that protection and comfort which he, above all men, eminently deserved at their hands.

You, his admirers, of the Island of Great Britain, will not fail to do justice to the memory of your "famous countryman," this "Noble of Nature," as Mr. Cobbett calls him. Let your sense of duty overwhelm the ingratitude of the inhabitants of the United States! Cherish his memory, propagate his principles, and, above all things, teach them to your children, and you will not fail to have their blessings to add to the pure reflections of a well-spent life!

R. CARLILE.

AN ADDRESS

Spoken at the Anniversary Dinner, in London, to commemorate the Birth-day of THOMAS PAINE, January 29, 1821.

BY J. W. DUNSTONE.

If e'er bright Muse! thy power has deign'd to shine
On lays so humble, unadorn'd as mine,
Assist me now, to sing the man whose mind
By WISDOM form'd, by truth alone refined,
To thee, would often raise the votive lay,
His soul inspired by genuine FREEDOM's ray.

By FREEDOM's ray! Oh FREEDOM hither come,
 With me to strew with flowers his honour'd tomb;
 THEE, would he worship in the silent hour,
 To thee he'd bend and supplicate thy power;
 Not for himself alone he sought thy aid,
 No selfish thought his servid mind e'er sway'd;
 But comprehending all, in one great plan
 He taught the world to know, "THE RIGHTS OF MAN."

Midst jarring wars in different climes he stood,
 The ready champion for the general good;
 Mild, though undaunted; firm, but not severe;
 He lent to every voice a ready ear;
 Prone to detect the sycophantic slave,
 In judgment, lenient; and though cautious, brave;
 Who first into a flame the embers fann'd
 That gave to FREEDOM's rule COLUMBIA's land.

MORALITY with placid mien attend,
 Inspire my song, which fain would laud thy friend;
 THEE in thy purity he most admired,
 The thoughts of thee his generous bosom fired,
 And in the fiery transport of the mind,
 "THE AGE OF REASON" burst upon mankind.
 Exposing all the follies of the crew,
 Whom thee, or true Religion never knew;
 Who pander all the sense by nature given,
 To worldly views, nor yield one thought to Heaven;
 Whose doctrines tend but to enslave the mind,
 Affright the feeble, and mislead the blind,
 The willing slaves of power, a tyrant band,
 Than locusts still more fatal to a land;
 By SUPERSTITION's aid they force a chain
 To fetter those who dare their rights maintain;
 Remorseless, cruel, persecuting, vile,
 By love of Gold inspired, and love of Guile,
 The sad reverse of all they ought to be,
 And all opposed MORALITY to thee!

This day EQUALITY we give to thee,
 Approach the hallow'd grave of PAINE with me;
 With cypress wreaths let every flowret bloom,
 To grace the precincts of his body's tomb;
 Come, with the MORAL DUTIES hand in hand,
 A soul-inspiring, honest-hearted band,
 And FREEDOM! LIBERTY! shall join the train,
 And lift the sadly pleasing votive strain.

This was the natal day of him who sleeps,
 Beneath the sod where TYRANNY still weeps;
 Then hither every VIRTUE wend your way,
 A last sad duty at his shrine to pay.

But, hark! whence those sounds on our silence now breaking,
 Like the breath of the west wind the foliage shaking;
 'Tis the hum of those myriads who join in the Song!
 Which to PAINE, and to all kindred spirits belong;
 EQUALITY! FREEDOM! MORALITY! see
 The homage of nations, is paying to THEE,
 While the time it shall come when no longer in war,
 Shall the demon of discord hurl terrors from far,
 But PEACE sweetly smiling, revisit the earth,
 And all shall rejoice on the day of thy birth,
 Shall hail THEE! who dared COMMON SENSE to maintain,
 And give blessings and plaudits eternal to PAINE!

REFLECTIONS MORAL AND POLITICAL.

(Continued from p. 79.)

Or suppose a dispute to arise between a party whose land adjoins the society's, and that society; and such difference might be adjusted by the society giving up or paying a trifle; but the six being rich, haughty, and consequential, would rather contest the point, at the risk of losing one of their shares, than to seem to submit to any other party, whose rank and power they did not consider equal to their own; for if they were to acknowledge their error, or to give way in the least, it then might appear that their consequence and pride were lessened. This arbitrary disposition, which is always produced by pride, might cause the society an expence of some hundreds of pounds, and then, if they were to compel each person (not the shares mind) to pay an equal share of the loss it would be but triflingly felt by the six who are rich, but the nineteen who are poor would feel it severely.

Now, if the six had retained only one vote each, instead of twenty-one votes, then the other nineteen would have been a check on that arbitrary feeling which pride and riches always produce. And all would have an equal interest in the society in proportion to their shares; for if one gained a profit of five pounds by his share, he who held four would gain twenty; and an equal right in making the laws would also tend to check arbitrary and haughty members from creating disputes and contentions in the society.

Just the same will it be with a nation when its members are to have a power in making the laws in proportion to their property. And this is precisely the case with the English system of govern-

ment. For that class of men who have the greatest share in the wealth of the country consists of men called Peers of the Realm, and they constitute what is called the House of Lords. Their number is about three hundred and seventy-five, and they have a power equal to that of about twenty-two millions of persons. These twenty-two millions are supposed to be represented in what is called the Commons' House, which is intended to act as a check on the Lords, so that neither the one nor the other can make a law without both consent to it. Here, then, we see that because these three hundred and seventy-five individuals have immense property, or possess half the land in the country, they pretend to have as much interest and anxiety for the welfare of it, and claim as much right to an equal power in making the laws for it, as the twenty-two millions!

But this is not the extent of the evil in this system of government; it not only gives the Lords a power equal to the Commons, but it also gives them the right of nominating the majority of the members in the House of Commons. About one hundred and forty-four of them do actually nominate three hundred members: one hundred and eighty-seven more members forming a majority, are nominated by government and one hundred and twenty-three rich individuals; consequently, the three hundred and seventy-five peers have the whole power, without any check whatever, to make such laws and to form such a government as they themselves may think necessary and proper.

Now, if these individuals have the same interest, advantage, and disadvantage, in all the laws which they do or might make in proportion to their shares or property in the country, then the danger would not be so great, or perhaps there might not be any; but if we find their interest is diametrically opposite to that of the twenty-two millions, what else can be expected but disaffection, disorder, confusion, and misery?

We will suppose that these lordly legislators should have a desire to enlarge the territory of the nation of which they are the rulers, on a supposition that it might be an advantage to the nation and to themselves, and if it were not, at least it would be sure to add to their power and profit, which would be a sufficient stimulus to them to make the attempt; for the desire of power is so common, that we see when men have a little they want more, and when they have a great deal they want a great deal more; in what way is the territory of this nation to be enlarged except by taking from some other, either by a mutual agreement between the two, or by force? If by the former, it is right; if the latter, wrong. But whenever we find rich men who thirst after increased riches and power, we also find in them ambition, which, when directed to improper objects, is one of the principal causes of all the evils that exist in society.

Therefore, if none but the rich are the rulers, and in them lurks

that deadly ambition which may lead them to make a claim where they have no right, they will then endeavour to establish that right by force, and this will produce contention and war, misery and bloodshed.

To carry on this contention or warfare which ambition has created, would probably require the lives of many of the people; at all events, it would require money of all, for continuing and defraying the expences of the contest. And if these ambitious rulers make a law and decide who are to pay these expences, and in what proportion each shall contribute towards them; if they should charge them on *persons*, instead of *property*, by levying taxes on the common necessities of life, that the poor must pay the same proportion as the rich; and if such expences as are collected in the name of taxes should go on increasing until the poor are deprived of nearly all the necessities of life, and then become the slaves to the rich; and that those of little property, and those in the middle ranks of society, should be fast falling into a state of wretchedness and slavery; and become the mere creatures and property of the rich; will not ambition have obtained its object one way, if force could not obtain it the other?

Or, to put the matter in another point of view, if the circulating capital, or the money in the country, whether it be gold, silver, or copper, or all of them, be only just a sufficiency for its intended purpose, and this contention or warfare should require a large proportion of it to be expended in other nations; then the prices of the produce of the country would be reduced in proportion to the quantity of money in circulation. Money being an article in trade for barter, the same as every other production of the earth, it would always produce a larger quantity of the necessaries or luxuries of life, in proportion to its scarcity; and then, the consequence would be that if the rich created and persevered in such contentions and wars, it would in proportion to the expence, or in proportion to the quantity of money drawn out of the country, lower the value of their lands and riches, which would be a sure check to their ambition.

But when we see the contrary is the fact, that instead of war being any way oppressive on the rich, by reducing the value of their lands or property in proportion to the expence it incurs, it increases the value, it heaps wealth upon wealth on the rich, and want upon want on the poor; that the rich have a great interest in promoting it, and the poor have none; that the one it enriches, the other it enslaves; while we see this to be the effect of war, can we wonder that we should have seen and heard of the long continuance of it, and of the desire which ambitious rulers and rich men have always had to create contention and warfare?

War must necessarily cause the nation to expend a sum of money to defray its expences. The sum required for the purpose would be in proportion to the power it has to contend with, and

the duration of the war. And if all persons were compelled to subscribe to the expences in proportion to their property or riches, all would then equally bear the burthen, and all would be anxious to prevent war and restore peace.

But if war creates a market for money, or a system of trafficking in money, and rich men having money in their coffers to lend, there being no other constant market for hire, their interest would then be to promote war, that they may lend on interest their unemployed money. Although money may at all times be kept in circulation in a nation by bartering for houses, lands, articles of consumption, or manufactured goods, yet, if the markets were glutted with these things of barter, the value of them would be lowered, and instead of a certainty of gaining an interest for the money so laid out or employed, it would be a speculation whether they would gain or not. Therefore, if monied men are the rulers of a nation, they will be very desirous of creating a money market, where some profit is always certain.

To establish a market for trading in money, or a market for lending of it, there must first be a scarcity of the article; the quantity must be reduced before people will go to market to hire it on interest.

Various are the ways of doing this. Suppose, for instance, the metal currency of a country were twenty millions, and only sixteen millions of it were wanted to be in circulation, the remaining four millions, being a superabundance or a surplus which is not required for immediate use, would be kept in store in case of necessity. It would rest in the coffers of those who were rich or who had more than their use required. Now, if the monied men are the rulers of a nation, is it not very probable that they will have a wish that some national expences might be incurred which would require the use of these four millions? And would not they be glad to lend to the nation at an interest? For, whether the expences are occasioned by war or any thing else, is of no matter to those whose only object is their own gain.

If the will of a nation were its power, would it ever be so absurd as to borrow four millions of money when it had four millions in store? for by collecting, in the name of taxes, four millions from the sixteen which is in circulation, money would become scarce, and the four millions laid up in store would become valuable and in request, and then it would be brought into circulation.

But by creating a great national expenditure, one that will require twelve millions of money, and that to be suddenly drawn out of its regular circulation, the depression it would leave on trade would be so quick and sudden, that at first sight it would seem better to borrow that sum for the nation; because, the nation could better afford to pay the interest than to realize the capital. Yet, when we consider that although the money which is

borrowed, is absolutely borrowed of the nation, that if there are but twenty millions of money capital in a nation, and twelve millions that should be required to be expended out of its regular course of circulation, whether that is drawn out by taxes levied on all in proportion to their property, or whether it is borrowed of all those who have it to lend, the fact of its being gone must be the same; there must be twelve millions less in circulation, and the effect produced by its loss must be precisely the same. Therefore, it clearly shews that there was something else in contemplation which this expenditure and borrowing system would certainly produce.

And what else was it but to produce a paper-currency instead? The rulers of the English nation did draw the metal currency out of its regular trade, by borrowing it of individuals on interest. The rich who have lent much are incorporated as a Bank Company, with liberty to make and issue their bank notes to an unlimited number; these pieces of paper, or notes, simply say, I promise to pay on demand, at the Bank, twenty shillings, or whatever the sum may be: now when we all know that cash can at any time be obtained for these notes when demanded, no one then cares whether they take them, or cash, for each will exchange or buy the same quantity of the produce of the country; and by establishing this confidence in the Bank, it can put into circulation any quantity it chooses.

Here, then, we see that rich men are the governors of the Bank; that rich men are the rulers of the nation, and that rich men lend their money to them; it is therefore clear that this system of expenditure and paper-money has been produced by rich men, and it generally happens, that when any one class of men have the establishing or the producing of any new system, they have some interested motive in it.

(To be continued.)

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR MR. CARLILE AND FAMILY.

Amount advertised..... £358 8 1]

From Huddersfield.

	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Abel Hellawell	0 5 0	A Lover of Truth and
A Friend to this System	0 2 6	Fair Play
An Atheist (M. W.)	0 1 0	A Reformer from my youth

	£. s. d.		£. s. d.
An Enemy to Tyranny	0 2 6	A Conscientious At-	
Materialist who thinks		torney	0 2 6
Virtue its own re-		W. Roebuck	0 2 6
ward, and Vice its		An Enemy to the Bridge	
own punishment	0 5 0	Street Company	0 2 6
An Enemy to Perse-		A Friend to Truth	0 0 6
cution	0 0 6	An Enemy to Persecution	1 0
A Friend to Truth W. H.	0 1 6	A. Walker (Raistrick)	0 2 6
John Heworth, a Re-		J. S. an Unitarian	0 1 0
former	0 3 0	A Deist	0 1 0
One who dislikes Reli-		A Free Thinker	0 1 0
gious Persecution	0 10 0	X. Y. Z.	0 2 0
J. B.	0 10 0	James Mc Lean	0 1 0
W. Machan	0 10 0	W. R.	0 0 6
J. J.	0 2 6	A Radical Reformer	0 1 0
B. Ormeroa	0 5 0	J. Dyson	0 0 6
A Friend to Liberty	0 1 0	A Cosmopolitan (C)	0 5 0
J. Smyth	0 1 0	W. Walker (Raistrick)	0 2 6
An Enemy to Tyranny	0 2 0	A Friend to Liberty	0 2 6
Richard Brown (Lock-		George Hart	0 0 6
wood)	0 1 0	George Rowe	0 0 6
Age of Reason, Rights		A Little Radical	0 0 6
of Man, and Com-		A Friend to Liberty	0 0 6
mon Sense (J.		A Friend to Humanity	0 0 6
H.)	0 2 6	A Friend to Truth	0 1 0
Doctor Sangrado, a		One averse to Perse-	
Dissenter from all		cution	0 2 0
Dissenters	0 5 0	E. Johnson	0 1 0
A Man who wishes all		Reason	0 2 0
well	0 2 0	A Church Warden	0 1 0

A Subscription of a few Friends at Marsden, who are desirous of seeing Religious Liberty throughout the World, and of aiding the Comforts of Mr. Richard Carlile, now a Prisoner in Dorchester Gaol.

A Free Thinker	1—0 0	James Holden	0 2 0
A Friend to Religious		James Harker	0 1 0
Liberty	1 0 0	Samuel Simpson	0 1 0
An Enemy to Tyranny		Jacobus Talure, jun.	0 2 0
and Oppression	1 0 0	Jonathan Scawthorn	0 1 0
A Friend to Liberty	0 5 0	John France	0 1 0
An Enemy to Corrup-		Robert Taylor	0 1 0
tion	0 5 0	An Enemy to Excessive	
An Enemy to the Bridge-		Taxation	0 1 0
Street Rascals	0 1 0	Christopher Russell	0 1 0
A Friend to all good		Joseph Brearley	0 1 0
things	0 3 0		

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
John Buckley	0	1	0	John Ashton	0	0	6
Frederick Hansom	0	1	0	John Horton	0	0	6
J. Shaw, a Real Re-				A Friend to Justice	0	2	6
former	0	1	0	William Holroyd	0	2	6
John Davies	0	1	0	Joseph Carter	0	0	3
Abraham Horsfall, D.D.	0	6		John Myers	0	0	6
John Truman	0	0	6	A Friend	0	1	0
Edward Rayner	0	0	6	An Enemy to Tyranny	0	1	0
Philip Shaw	0	1	0	Abraham Liversedge	0	1	0
James Horsefall	0	1	0	A Friend to Carlile	0	1	0
A Friend to Truth and				A Free Thinker	0	2	6
Justice	0	0	6	B. Holroyd	0	2	0

By the Friends of Freedom at Aldmonbury.

John Dearden	0	1	6	James Butterworth	0	0	6
Wm. Boothroyd	0	1	0	The Laws of Nature	0	1	0
To Enjoy is to Obey	0	1	0	J. C. Broadbent	0	1	0
An Enemy to Perse- cution	0	1	0	Daniel Thorp Sharp	0	1	0
A Friend or Two in Kaye Lane	0	1	6	Edward Harling	0	0	6
A Lover of Freedom	0	1	3	Old Sam Buckley	0	1	0
An Enemy to Kings and Priests	0	1	3	Joseph Moss	0	0	6
A Lover of Freedom	0	1	6	Marsden Subscription	5	9	3
Trial by Jury	0	1	6	Huddersfield ditto	5	14	0
					£.	12	0
						0	3

London Subscriptions received by the Committee, (continued).

Providence	0	1	0	T. Jefferys, ditto	0	0	3
By the hand of Mr. H.	0	2	0	G. Stanley, ditto	0	0	3
Ditto of Mr. Watts	0	2	6	— King, ditto	0	0	3
Wm. Stote and Rich. Humphreys	0	2	0	A. Wall, ditto	0	0	3
Mr. Marbeth	0	2	6	Elfrow	1	3	0
Jno. Meredith	0	5	0	A Friend	1	0	0
William Marshall	0	2	0	New Year's Gift	0	0	6
G. Hall	0	1	0	God save Carlile	0	2	6
Jno. Birch	0	0	6	A Friend	0	2	2
H. Medley	0	2	6	J. Buckley	0	1	0
T. Bowyer, Deist and Republican	0	0	3	Jno. Bartlett	0	1	6
R. Kenzie, ditto	0	0	3	Mr. Wilkinson	0	1	0
W. Pavey, ditto	0	0	3	What every Man ought to do	0	0	2
W. Cox, ditto	0	0	3	I'll call for a Book some Day	0	2	6

	£. s. d.		£. s. d.
Pirkley	0 1 0	D. Z.	0 2 0
Fifth Payment of T. O. K. to keep open the brave Mr. Carlile's Shop	0 2 0	For Miss C.	0 1 0
C. W. Suiet, Esq. a profound Deist, now a Resident in France	0 10 0	A Coal-heaver's Week- ly Subscription	0 0 6
A Friend	0 5 0	Anonymous	0 0 6
Popp'd in the Hole	0 1 0	Ditto	0 0 1
H. Noss	0 0 6	Ditto	0 0 4
The Ropemakers at Shadwell	0 11 4	W. H. (weekly)	0 0 1
Mr. K.	0 2 0	A Friend	0 0 1
Ditto	0 2 0	Success to Carlile	0 0 6
Ditto 2d Subscription	2 0 0	J. C. (monthly)	0 2 0
Wm. Stote and R. Humphreys	0 2 0	W. T.	0 1 0
God is unchangeable ; in him is neither va- riableness or sha- dows of a turning ; he is the same yes- terday, to-day, and for ever: God is not a man, that he should lie, nor the son of man, that he should repent.—D. King, an Admirer of Reason	0 1 0	B. T.	0 1 0
God repented that he made man, and was sorry, and it grieved him to the heart ; and God repented him of that which he said he would do, and the thing which he said he would do he did it not.—D. King, a Disbeliever that God can either lie or repent, and a Detester of Blas- phemy	0 1 0	A. Ferguson	0 1 0
A Friend	0 0 6	A Well-wisher	0 2 6
		Old Nurse	0 0 6
		A Friend	0 0 6
		T. Whatson	0 0 6
		T. Cracknell	0 1 0
		A Friend who thinks Deists are ill-used	0 2 6
		A Deist	0 0 1
		G. D.	0 0 6
		R. Scott	0 0 6
		A Farmer of the Bank of Quait, a Friend of Reform, and an Enemy to Oppres- sion	1 0 0
		I wish you Luck	0 0 2
		Anonymous	0 0 6
		Ditto	0 0 6
		Ditto	0 0 4
		A Deist and Republican	0 4 3
		W. Rawlings	0 5 0
		G. W.	0 2 0
		Mr. Watts	0 3 1
		H. Nursa	0 0 6
		Mr. Rayner	0 0 6
		J. J.	0 10 0
		God bless Carlile, 2d Subscription	0 2 6
		Anonymous	0 1 0
		J. Cobbett	0 1 0
		Per Mr. Watling	0 1 0
		A Left-off Quaker	0 1 0

Subscriptions received at 55, Fleet Street, where a Committee sits every Monday evening, from six to ten o'clock, for that and other purposes connected with the Subscription, or through the medium of the post in Dorchester Gaol.

R. Carlile acknowledges the receipt of one shilling for Robert Wedderburn, which he sent to the Keeper of this Prison, and which has again formed an important matter for the consideration of the Magistrates of the county of Dorset, at their late Quarter Sessions at Blandford, as to whether it would be proper for the Keeper to give or send this shilling to Wedderburn himself, or to return it to the said Richard Carlile for to be sent through the Dorchester Post Office, in which course it would have to pass twice through the said Keeper's hands. After a long deliberation it was decided, that Richard Carlile should send the shilling he had received for Robert Wedderburn to him through the Dorchester Post Office, for the purpose of adding a penny to Mr. Nicholas Vansittart's revenue, and that the said Keeper should again return the shilling to Richard Carlile for that purpose.

Mr. Wedderburn's imprisonment expires in the month of May next: he will then have borne an imprisonment of two years for having spoken irreverently of the Jew Moses, the Jew Jesus, and some other Jews, whose vices are narrated in the Jew Books. His imprisonment has been made as solitary as it was possible to be made in this Gaol. He has borne it with the greatest fortitude, and R. Carlile would particularly recommend his constancy to the encouragement of the friends of free discussion.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Huddersfield, Jan. 18, 1822.

IT is with no small degree of pleasure that I address you, as the organ of a few Friends to Civil and Religious Liberty, who have long felt the propriety and necessity of entering into a subscription to assist in enabling you to bear up against that tide of oppression, imprisonment and fines imposed upon you and your family by men interested in supporting and fostering error, and in putting down by the strong arm of power, all those who honestly endeavour to inform the ignorant, and to dispel the mist from the eyes of those that are labouring under the grossest delusion. We do not arrogate to ourselves infallibility, yet we know of no

other mode of acquiring truth, but that of serious and fearless investigation.

I merely intimated to our friends that I conceived the present a proper term for putting our wishes into effect, to which they cheerfully acceded. I therefore enclose you the sum of Twelve Pounds, the particulars of which are on the other side. You will perceive that we have been ably supported by a few friends at Marsden, a village seven miles from here, *who are most hearty in your cause*. I shall feel happy to receive a line from you upon the receipt of this that I may be assured it has reached you in safety; with my best wishes to Mrs. Carlile, yourself, and sister, I remain on behalf of your friends in this neighbourhood,

Your faithful Fellow Citizen,

ABEL HOLLOWELL,
Tin Plate Worker, Manchester Street.

P.S. I am in expectation of something more being done for you, whatever it is, I will carefully forward it.

TO MR. A. HOLLOWELL, TIN-PLATE WORKER,
MANCHESTER STREET, HUDDERSFIELD.

Dorchester Gaol, Jan. 16th, 1822.

FRIEND AND CITIZEN,

YESTERDAY's post brought me your letter and contents to the amount of £12., for which you will accept my thanks, in conjunction with all my friends at Huddersfield, Aldmonbury, and Marsden.

Your communication has given me a double pleasure; it has convinced me again that my humble efforts to propagate truth, or, at least, to incite discussion that may lead to it, has not been vain, even in a quarter where I had no knowledge that a single publication of mine had reached, and where even the name of any one inhabitant was unknown to me, until a friend at Leeds lately sent me your name, as a friend to Civil and Religious Liberty: it further displays to our enemies, that the wicked clamour about blasphemy and sedition can no longer prejudice and brutalize the minds of the friends of Human Liberty, who are determined to think and inquire upon all matters for themselves, instead of yielding up their reasoning faculties to the

Vol. V. No. 4.

keeping of Priests and Tyrants. It is thus I have a double pleasure in your communication and support.

Every day brings me some fresh stimulus to perseverance in the grand cause of demanding a free discussion on all points of interest to mankind, and of putting it into practice. I begin to feel strength from the number of good and virtuous men who rally round me with their names and support, and daily increase in number.

My principles are simple in the extreme, and intelligible to every man who will look at them. In political Government, I contend for the Representative System, which, to be perfect and pure, requires to be extended, in the right of suffrage, to every man, and that magistrates, as well as legislators, shall be the choice of the people, and not the dictation of individuals or factions. In matters of religion or philosophy, I hold that every man is not only entitled to hold what opinions he pleases, but to communicate those opinions to any other man disposed to listen to or examine them. I reject all controul over the mind of man. Nothing but vicious actions can be justly amenable to restraint in social and political Government.

On these two points I challenge discussion and examination; and until any man can shew me that I am in error by other arguments than imprisonment and fines, I shall go on to propagate them to the fullest possible extent; and whilst I continue in this disposition, I flatter myself that my moral force will be strengthened with the continued support of the inhabitants of Huddersfield and its vicinity.

I am, Citizen and Friend,

Gratefully yours,

R. CARLILE.

TO THE CHRISTIAN JUDGE BAILEY.

I PURSUE my promise of addressing you weekly on the subject of the Book of Common Prayer, upon which you have written notes and comments. At the end of the work, you confess that you once doubted "the divine origin of the Christian Dispensation;" from which it may be inferred, that you were once a Deist or Atheist. Oh! how glad I am that my adversary hath written a book! May I

not enquire, Whether you, when you doubted the truth of the Christian Religion, ventured to express those doubts to others? or, Whether your view of law was then, as it is now, "*that every man might hold what opinions he pleases, but that he must not impeach the faith of others?*" This is an important question between you and me. Here we have it printed under your sanction that you once ventured to doubt the truth of the Christian Religion, and yet you have since had the conscience, the hypocrisy, and I might now add the villainy, to be the organ of sending me to this Gaol for three years, and of robbing me of property to the value of five thousand pounds; for doing the same thing, as you confess to all the world that you yourself have done. The difference is only this, we have no proof that you published your doubts at the time of holding them, and there is proof that I have so done. But am I less honest than you for publishing what I verily believed, and what I considered, and do now consider, to be of the very first importance to mankind, that they should have a full understanding upon the matter. Because you played the hypocrite, and probably professed what you did not believe, you escaped punishment, and because I have professed what you say you once believed, and what also I did believe and do now believe, you make yourself the base instrument of punishing me for not being so great a hypocrite as yourself, upon your own confession.

It would be well if we could ascertain the exact time that your doubts were removed. At the origin of the Vice Society, you were, I believe, what is called a Serjeant at Law, or a King's Serjeant, and your name is enrolled among the first subscribers. At least, I can say, that I have seen the name of Mr. Serjeant Bailey on a list of the members of that society printed in 1804, and I believe on another printed in 1802. The avowed object of that Association, among other things, went to prevent all calling in question the truths of the Christian Religion. Of course we might charitably suppose that your doubts were all removed before you subscribed to this association, and this would bring us forward to the time of your appointment as Serjeant at Law. It strikes me very forcibly, that it was this, or some such appointment, which tended to the removal of your doubts.

You say, at the conclusion of your book, that *It was commenced under a firm conviction, after doubt and examination, of the divine origin of the Christian Dispensa-*

tion: from this, it may be inferred, that you began to write your notes on the Book of Common Prayer soon after that conviction had taken place, and it is not probable, that until you found yourself settled in an elevation at the Bar or on the Bench, you could find time to write notes on such a subject. A mere lawyer or barrister's time, who has a few briefs, is generally occupied in a different way, and to me it appears evident, that the appointment to some office was the great cure of all your doubts about the truth of the Christian Religion, and the chief stimulus to your writing notes on the Book of Common Prayer. The depth of villainy seems too great to attribute to one man, to imagine that you formed one of the Vice Society at a time when you doubted the truth of the Christian Religion. I will not go so far as to imagine this. The Serjeant's coif is almost a sure prelude to the Scarlet Robes, and I will believe that Mr. Justice Bailey was made a Serjeant and a Christian at the same time.

The title of your book is, "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England; and the Sunday Lessons from the Old Testament: with Notes on the Epistles, Gospels, Psalms, and Lessons."

In the first place, I shall contend and shew that this book is a book of instructions for the practice of idolatry, according to the form of the Christian Church: in the second, that your notes upon it are mere nonsensical trash, and the effusions of a mind neither honest or sane.

All religion is idolatry: prayer, according to the sense of this book, is a part of religion, therefore prayer is idolatry. The first question is to whom are the prayers of this book addressed. The answer must be to Jehovah, to Jesus, and to some thing, or person, called the Holy Ghost, with the Communion of Saints. Now I contend there are none such animals or spirituals as these words seem to designate in existence, in any part of space. They are non-entities: they are imaginary idol gods: they never did exist after having passed the animal, in any other sensitive and distinguishable form. Beyond the books called the Old and New Testament, and the Jewish and Christian legends, with their forms of idolatry, we not only cannot find any proof of such existences, but we have no account of them; and every intelligent and honest enquirer after truth rejects the tales about them with a deserved contempt. Astronomy

denies those supposed existences any portion in space; and Chemistry has annihilated every idea of spiritual beings or essences being to be found in the material world. Thus those two sciences have completely kicked Jehovah, Jesus, the Holy Ghost, the Devil or Satan, with both good and evil spirits, quite out of existence, and the idolators are left to pray with empty heads and minds to non-entities! The person who prays acts the part of a madman, and something worse, for the latter is sometimes coherent and expresses himself so as to be understood, but the former never either understands what he is about, nor can be understood by others.

The administration of the Sacraments, as they are called, are equally unintelligible and idolatrous, and are mere copies of the Eleusinean mysteries of the Pagan world, and a substitute for their horrid sacrifices of different animals human and inhuman. The love feasts, which were observed among the early Christians, were the substitutes for the rites, sacraments, and ceremonies performed in the Temple of Venus; and every thing in the early part of the Christian Religion was made to win the attachment of the Pagan multitude by assimilating it to their former manners and dispositions.

Under this view of your Book of Common Prayer and Notes, I shall not have to enter into any elaborate argument to support the position I have taken; I shall merely notice and ridicule the gross absurdities it contains, both in text and notes. For the present week I shall be content with the title-page, and the notice I have taken of your concluding observations as to your former doubts of the truths of the Christian Religion. This I consider quite enough for you and your admirers to ponder upon for one week: in the next, I shall produce something, on your part, equally incongruous and hypocritical, and so on until I have done with you.

Present my compliments to your mild, meek, and charitable brother, Best, and believe me to be the same as when we parted in the Court of King's Bench.

R. CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, Jan. 13, 1822,
of the Era of the Carpenter's Wife's Son.

P. S. I never doubt without reasons to support the act; but it appears that you doubted without reasons, and sought reasons to dispel that doubt in the Serjeant's Coif, and the Judge's Robe.

STODDART, DR., MURRAY AND SHARPE, *versus*
THE TEMPLE OF REASON.

THIS triad of knaves have been at length convinced that they will foam their venom in vain against the Temple of Reason. It is impregnable to all their attacks, and its defenders smile with contempt at the puny efforts of their assailants.

Dr. Stoddart (I will leave off calling him *Slop* for the good he has done me) is furious and exhibits some danger and prognostics of hydrophobia. He not only curses but lies to excite the bigots and knaves to the battle. In quoting last week three passages from my publications, he wilfully altered one, and gave another a wrong designation. He stated that there was exposed in a pamphlet in the shop a phrase, "*The Factious Jesus.*" The allusion was to the head of the article in the first number of "The Republican," upon the birth-days of Thomas Paine, the real Englishman, and the factitious Jesus, the Jew. The word was written *fictitious*, it was printed *factitious*, and the cunning Doctor by leaving out a syllable, has made it *factious*. The error in printing was of no consequence, as either word equally expressed my meaning, but to render factitious *factious* in a quotation could only have been done by Dr. Stoddart, or Murray, or Sharpe. The other false quotation was more in meaning than in manner. The Doctor stated, that he had laying before him my last "Address to the Reformers," in which, among other things, was the following "detestable" passage: *Indeed it is surprising to me, that man, national man, should be led away by the tales of priests, resting on no better foundation than the book which is called the Bible!* There was but one slight misprint in this passage, and that was to make the word *rational* into *national*. What a national man is, as a matter of distinction, I must leave to the Doctor to say: he found no such word in my pamphlet. But the sentence was not in the "Address to the Reformers," as the Doctor states, it was written in a letter to me by a very respectable farmer of Hambledon, in Hampshire, a Mr. Goldsmith, who, I know, will not feel ashamed of Dr. Stoddart's noticing it in the way he has done.

But, in the very same day's paper, the Doctor strikes a terrible blow himself at the Christian Religion, in an extract from the petition of a Mr. Loveday to the French Chamber

of Deputies, upon the subject of having had his daughter seduced to the Catholic Religion: In this extract I found the following designation of the Christian Religion: "Odious superstition, which seems destined to plunge France once more into the gloom of ignorance and the horrors of fanaticism: Deputies of a Nation on which such brilliant lights have shone, and which has given birth to so many great men, Would you credit it? It is the history of a Jew and a prostitute." This is the designation of the Christian Religion, I find in Dr. Stoddart's paper. I read it repeatedly and could not make any other meaning of it, although it would seem the latter member of a sentence referred to some legend of the Christians, and not to the origin of the Christian Religion, as Mr. Hone has announced an explanation of the phrase. With me it is a true designation of the Christian Religion. No words could have been better thrown together for that purpose: but I do not mean to say that the writer of the petition wished to convey the impression I received from his words. At any rate it was an attack upon the Christian Religion, and I hope the Vice Society will indict Dr. Stoddart for a blasphemous libel in giving circulation to such an expression. I begin to fear the Doctor will come back to his old professions, and try to draw off the support I receive, by a more violent attack upon the Christian Religion than that which I am now making. He is a complete renegade for the best pay: like a Swiss soldier. His abuse and impudence would be admirably fitted to cut up the bigots. I would rather take the Doctor into my firm, or my gang, as his present rival the "Old Times" calls it, than he should open in the same way for himself, and I hereby offer to negotiate with him for that purpose, if he will send me his terms. I can assure him the concern will be more durable and more profitable than to belie his conscience in the support of kingcraft and priestcraft as he is doing at present. I will take in Robert Southey with him, as I think his poetry and his prose would operate most powerfully upon the bigots. I shall very soon print another threepenny edition of his *Wat Tyler*. The first edition of twenty-five thousand are all gone, save a few the Robber Rothwell stole from me. He has never written any thing to equal it since he quitted the "Satanic School."

But to return to Dr. Stoddart, Murray, and Sharpe. They still threaten to put me down, and I still respond that they cannot, they shall not. All the indictments which

they have lately obtained, or since my sister's case, in which they were defeated, have been upon one pamphlet, and they have occasioned such an excessive demand for it, that it is now nearly out of print. They cannot go to trial whilst Garratt is sheriff upon any one case, if they do, it will end in nothing, as all their former cases have done. I should like to know how much money they have left. I will lend them a few pounds rather than they shall stop, or rather than Sharpe shall become a third time bankrupt, and pay nothing as a dividend again. I hear that Castle-reagh has provided for him. They are birds of a feather. Murray and Pritchard had better join their concerns. They are equally favourites of Wilberforce.

R. CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, Jan. 14, 1822.

TO MR. CARLILE.

" —————— Oh place! oh form!
How often dost thou with thy case, thy habit,
Wrench awe from fools, and tie the wiser souls
To thy false seeming! blood thou art but blood,
Let's write good angel on the devil's horn,
'Tis not the devil's crest."

MY DEAR SIR,

IT is a circumstance as obvious as it is true, and numberless might be the instances adduced to prove the fact, that what is evidence to one man is contradiction to another; and that which would convince this, makes a sceptic of that individual. And this difference of opinion appears to be absolutely necessary; as, if we all thought, we might all act alike, which, if it were not attended with much mischief to society, would, at least, deprive it of every stimulus to that inquiry which is indispensable to its improvement and knowledge.

It has been asserted by Christians in general, that had there been no other *revelation* than the Ten Commandments, it would have been sufficient to convince them of the existence of a supreme Being, possessing all the infinite and excellent attributes ascribed to deity; and also that the arrangement of these commands, as they respect our duty

towards God and one another, is such as could only be dictated by infinite goodness and wisdom.

Upon those commands which relate to our conduct towards each other, it is not my intention to comment, because there is not any thing to which I can object, so far as it regards their moral tendency; but surely there is nothing in them that shews the impress of the divine finger, nothing more than what the most uncivilized man of the least civilized society would have dictated, that had any notions of an exclusive right to acquired property, and of the love and respect due to the authors of our being, and our fellow men. To suppose, therefore, for a moment, that these commands were actually delivered by the hand of that Being, whom no man has seen, or can see, or comprehend, to any individual whatever, a candid perusal of the first four, which by Christians are considered the most important, and, consequently, the strongest testimony of divine authority, will prove to be the most preposterous of all inferences.

It has ever been an opinion of mine, my dear Sir, that no being, possessing real dignity and innate excellence, would either command, or court, the praise or adoration of other beings. He might, perhaps, receive it, but it would be that homage, or that adoration, which is freely given to intrinsic worth and excellence; and not that which is imperiously exacted to gratify false dignity and contemptible pride.

"Thou shalt have no other God besides me," is the peremptory, despotic language contained in the first, and what is termed the *grand* commandment; but instead of its being enforced by a lively and conciliatory description of the character and attributes of a being, who, in another part of these writings, is emphatically termed *love*, a gloomy representation is set forth, and repeated again and again; lest, it would almost appear, mankind should imbibe too high and favourable an opinion of him, whom they are thus called upon exclusively to adore. And this leads me to the consideration of the second of these commands, which appears to me so much the more objectionable than the first, as it contains a grosser libel against the divine mind than any uttered throughout the *sacred* volume.

After the following injunctions, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them," the Deity is made to say, "for I the Lord thy God am a *jealous* God, visiting the

iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

To say nothing of the gross injustice, or, rather, of the destruction of all equity, that would follow the punishment of the innocent for the guilty, every day's experience shews the fallacy of the declaration, that "the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children." Nay, it is flatly contradicted in another part of this very book. "And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh! this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if thou *wilt*, forgive their sin; and if not, blot *me*, I pray thee, out of thy book, which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, whosoever *hath sinned* against me, *him* will I blot out of my book." And, in another place, "Doth not the Lord thy God send rain on *the evil and on the good*; and make the sun to shine on *the just and on the unjust*?" It is almost an insult offered to the good sense of your readers, to make any comment upon, what I might justly term, the *blasphemous* clause contained in this command, where the Deity is said to be a *jealous* God; for surely, to say nothing of the utter impossibility of any thing like passion pertaining to the divine mind, and, least of all, the contemptible one of jealousy, the most stupid being in existence would have an object some way worthy of such a feeling, how much more so, admitting, for argument's sake, the possibility of his being rivalled, the infinite Creator of all worlds. But of whom is he said to entertain so vile a passion? Of graven images—of gods made by human beings—of senseless and misshapen figures of wood and of stone!!! But enough of such monstrous absurdities and degrading representations of a Being who is infinite in all the great and glorious attributes of perfect love, wisdom, and benevolence.

The next command that presents itself to our notice and consideration is couched in the following language: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." We can hardly conceive any thing more silly, or, at least, more unnecessary, than a command forbidding the profanation of a name which has never yet been communicated to us.

The declaration of Moses, where he says that the Almighty represented himself as "I AM THAT I AM," is too

contemptible to have proceeded from the mouth of an infinitely wise Being. It reminds me of the way in which the fair sex is said to argue, or rather, to prove a thing—*It is so, because it is so.* In fact, it demonstrates at one view, either that the Almighty was incapable of designating himself by any appropriate term; or else, that Moses was a gross impostor. And this brings me to the fourth, and last command, which I intend noticing. “Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates: *for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is; and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.*” A good and wholesome command this, so far as it respects the observing of it as a day of recreation or rest from labour; the objection we have arises from what is said to have occasioned it, viz. the *rest* which an infinitely powerful Being took from labours that are described more like those of a conjuror than of a Divine Being. And although Christians pretend to see great beauty and sublimity in the command, and in the expression that contains the fulfilment of that command, “Let there be light, and there was light,” yet, for my own part, I must confess, that nothing appears to me more like the *hocus pocus* of a trickster; unless, indeed, we suppose the command to be given to some other power; which, in this case, would prove that it was not the Almighty who made the universe, consequently, that he required no rest from any such labours: but if the Deity is not giving the command to some other power, I must observe once again, that nothing appears so truly silly and unworthy the great and exalted character of omnipotent wisdom, than that he should be represented as commanding himself.

But, however it be, the command appears, practically, to concern Heathens as much as it does Christians; for neither one nor the other observe this, or, indeed, any of the preceding commands, which, in my humble opinion, is the greatest of all proofs that they never emanated from Deity; because an infinitely wise, benevolent, and omniscient Being would never give laws that he knew either would not or could not be obeyed.

The command, “Thou shalt have no other God beside

me," the Trinitarian Christian will say is most sacredly observed by him, although his creed compels him to profess that he believes in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Catholic will declare as much of the second, although he is daily bowing his knee to various graven images. And both of them will as solemnly aver their strict observance of the third, although each is in the habit of using the name, by which they call upon their triune Deity for the most ignoble of purposes, that of naming streets and houses, squares and churches, colleges and corporations, rows and lanes: while the fourth is not only disregarded altogether, but, as though Christian professors of every denomination were willing to render their disobedience and opposition to this command of the Deity as conspicuous as possible, instead of observing the seventh day as one of recreation or rest, it is made the most laborious of any throughout the week.

So much for the Christian's consistency. He receives laws according to his own account from Deity, and which therefore can never require either alteration or the least modification whatever, for says the Almighty, "Have I not said and shall it not be established;" and Christ, "Heaven and earth shall pass away sooner than one tittle of the law shall fail:" and yet our modern Christians do not hesitate to break, and, which is the same thing, to modify the commands of an infinitely wise and immutable Being, and, what is worse, to persecute their fellow-men for setting forth their errors, or not conforming to their dogmas.

But we have not yet to learn, that Christianity, like every other religion, is maintained at the expence of the fears and pockets of the great bulk of its professors; and while it continues so to do, every opinion, however liberal and worthy the consideration of mankind, if it appears at all to militate against the erroneous doctrines of the day, and the interests of those who propagate them, will be cried down as blasphemous and Atheistical; and no longer than it operates upon either of these, no longer will it be encouraged or supported by the great and powerful.

"Great is Diana of the Ephesians," said certain champions of that goddess, whose image, it was as firmly averred, "came down from heaven," as that the man Christ did. And for a similar reason; because, in the former instance, those who proclaimed Diana's greatness were the "craftsmen, who received no small gains from the silver shrines they made for her;" and in the latter instance, those who pro-

claim the modern system of Christianity to be "glad tidings of great joy to all people," are the priests, or *crafty-men*, whose gains from their impostures are as immense as they are infamously oppressive. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians;" and, without at all examining the truth of such a declaration, the credulous Ephesians believed it. "Glad tidings of great joy to all people is Christianity," we hear resounded again and again from the rostrums of the temples of every sect and denomination of Christians, and the people are equally as credulous as the followers of Diana. Like the honest sailor of old, who, when asked whether he credited the story of Jonah and the whale, replied, "Certainly I do; for I remember our Priest saying that it was strictly true: and had he told us, *that Jonah had swallowed the whale*, instead of the whale having swallowed Jonah, and that he vomited it up whole and alive again, after having been three days and as many nights in his belly, I should as readily have believed it." I repeat again, that, like this poor simple individual, Christian professors gulp down, as easily as the whale is said to have done Jonah, every doctrine that is advanced by their Priests, let it be as absurd, contradictory, and preposterous, as that of Jonah and the whale; of Moses and the bush; of the wrestling of the Deity with Father Jacob; of Moses talking face to face with the Deity, as one man talketh to another; of the great Creator of the universe dictating the form and fashion of cloaks and breeches, of smocks and petticoats, snuffers and candlesticks, grates and tongs, spoons and pans, circumcision and uncircumcision, dung-holes and dung-paddles, or any other such pretty stories, of which there are not a few, contained in the sacred volume.

Who that has ever heard or read an exposition of the faith and hope of the modern Christian, does not shrink appalled at the recollection of the dreadful doctrines enforced; and affrighted, or disgusted, at the effrontery of the wretch who dared to advance them as "glad tidings of great joy to all people." Glad tidings! what! when it is solemnly declared that no man can be saved but by Christ; and that those who have not received him as their saviour, and been washed with his blood, shall perish everlasting? "Glad tidings *to all people!*" Surely not to the myriads of human beings that have never heard even the name of Christ, nor ever will hear it! Glad tidings of great joy! What a hellish, fiend-like mind must that being possess, who can assert Christianity to be such, when, at the same time, he declares

it teaches even the everlasting tortures of hell-fire to be the portion of innocent babes, that never lived long enough to know the difference between virtue and vice, and, consequently, could never have sinned even in thought! Glad tidings of great joy! Surely not to the affectionate husband, and the loving partner of his bosom, at the dreadful prospect which futurity presents to their view, when the one or the other, or both, together with their much-loved offspring, and esteemed relatives and friends, may, for aught they know, be doomed to everlasting torment and woe! Christianity glad tidings of great joy to all people! Rather the most woeful announcement that could possibly reach their ears—the bitterest curse that the most diabolical demon of the infernal regions could entail upon mankind. Glad tidings! No, not more such to those who are saved, than to those who are damned; for surely that being must be destitute of every thing like human feeling, who, even though he may be satisfied in himself that he is one of those elected for eternal bliss, could remain happy a single moment of his existence under the impression, that the greatest part of mankind, and amongst them his dearest friends and relatives, were doomed to suffer everlasting, indescribable torments.

Such, however, with little variation and few exceptions, are the doctrines promulgated throughout Christendom in the nineteenth century; and as though the Priesthood were willing to try how far they could impose upon the credulity of mankind, it has been impiously urged by them that the cries and yellings and gnashing of teeth of the damned in hell, shall sound as much to the glory of God as the praises and hallelujahs of the *blessed* in heaven!

So much for modern Christianity and the Christian's God; and yet Deists, for opposing such monstrous dogmas, so dishonourable to the great and benevolent Creator of the universe, are termed infidels and blasphemers. Blasphemers forsooth! If the term blasphemy has any definite meaning, convey any idea, or has any signification whatever, it surely applies to those doctrines of Christianity, of which we have given but a very faint outline. Deists blasphemers, indeed! Yes, if to expose the fallacy of such declarations, and the hypocrisy of those who make them, be blasphemy—if to vindicate the sacred character of the infinitely wise, just, and benevolent Parent of all flesh from aspersions as dishonourable as they are opposed to his nature and attributes, be such, then indeed is the epithet justly be-

stowed ; and Deists need not be ashamed of the appellation. As to the charge of infidelity, it need only be observed, that like that of blasphemy, it is the property of another party ; nor will Deists ever think of claiming it, until, like the advocates of Christianity, they profess one thing and believe another ; and vilify and persecute their fellow-men for the non-observance of those commands which themselves do not in the least hesitate to break as often as it suits their views and purposes. Christians, persecutors ! Why surely this is a contradiction in terms ; a thing as impossible as that vice can be virtue—good, evil ; as impossible, as that the genuine followers of him, whose language was, “ Love even your enemies ; do good to them which hate you ; bless them that curse you ; and pray for them that despitefully use you. Even unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek, offer also the other ; and of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them. For if ye love them that love you, what merit have ye ? for sinners also love those that love them : but be ye merciful, even as your Father in heaven is merciful. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged ; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned ; but forgive, and ye shall be forgiven ;” should be found amongst those wretches, the bane and pest of society, who, instead of going about “ to relieve the fatherless and the widow in their affliction,” the poor and destitute in their sickness and calamity, are either seeking for objects on whom they may gratify their savage malignity by persecuting them for difference of opinion ; or are “ devouring widows’ houses ” the scanty pittance which the hand of Charity has left behind it for the support of the destitute and friendless orphans, together with the property of their fellow-men, and “ for a pretence, make long prayers.”

The motives, however, which actuate these men, in their diabolical persecutions and misrepresentations of Deists, arise from the very same cause that actuated the interested hypocrites of Ephesus : and I cannot set them in a better light than by quoting the writer of the Acts of Christ’s Apostles. “ A certain man, named Demetrius, a silversmith, who made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain to the craftsmen, whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know, that by this craft we have our wealth. Moreover, ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded the people, saying, That

they are no Gods which are made with hands : (and he might have added, by human invention) so that this craft is in danger to be set at nought." Thus it is evident that the diabolical malignity with which these men pursue those who are bold and honest enough to follow the dictates of conscience, and to defend the truth, arises not from any zeal they have for Christianity in the abstract; but for the honours and wealth impiously heaped upon those who dare to advance doctrines the most mischievous and inimical to the welfare and happiness of mankind.

But I perceive I am wandering from the subject with which I set out; and I therefore return to it by observing, that if further proof be required that the Jewish laws were not delivered to them by the Deity, reference must be given to the Prophets themselves, especially to Isaiah and Jeremiah, who flatly contradict every thing of the kind. "To what purpose," says Isaiah, "is the multitude of your sacrifices, saith the Lord, when ye come to appear before me, *who hath required them at your hand?*" And Jeremiah, "For *I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them,* saith the Lord, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices." It may, therefore, as reasonably and fairly be inferred, from the above statement, that if Moses imposed on the Jewish people in one instance, he did in every other; especially, when we reflect, that with very few exceptions, the communications pretended to have been received by this man were of the most silly, cruel, and frequently of the most disgusting nature; and therefore derogatory to the sacred character of the great and universal Parent. Let man, therefore, leave the vain and absurd doctrines, traditions, professions, catechisms, creeds, and articles of *faith*, and follow the simple dictates of nature and of reason, which teach, that the Lord our God requires of us nothing more nor less than "to do justice, to love mercy, and to conduct ourselves with becoming humility."

With every sentiment of the most heart-felt admiration and esteem, I subscribe myself yours truly,

Gottenburg. T. WHITWORTH.